

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, and 19 have been cancelled. Claims 4, 8, 10-18, and 20-27 remain pending in the application. Claims 4, 8, 10, 12, 13, 20, and 21-27 have been amended. Reconsideration of the pending claims in view of the amendments above and remarks below is respectfully requested.

**Written Statement Regarding Substance of 5/2/06 Interview per
37 CFR 1.133(b)**

Applicant appreciates the opportunity to discuss the rejection under 35 USC 112 with Examiner Drodge in the telephone interview that occurred on May 2, 2006, at 12:00 p.m. EST. Those participating in the interview included the undersigned and Examiner Drodge. In accordance with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.133(b), Applicant provides the following written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action.

No exhibits were shown or discussed. The claims that were discussed were independent claims 1, 10, 13, and 19, which included the phrase, "wherein the molecularly imprinted inorganic gel coating is more effective in removing the solute from the fluid relative to an inorganic gel coating that has not been molecularly imprinted with the template molecule, where both filtrations are performed under similar conditions."

The general thrust of Applicant's argument was that deleting the above phrase would obviate the Examiner's rejection under 35 USC 112.

It appeared as though the Examiner and Applicant

preliminarily reached an agreement that deleting the above phrase would obviate the rejection under 35 USC 112.

Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

1. Claims 1-27 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

Applicant has deleted each occurrence of the objectionable phrase as described above. Specifically, the phrase has been removed from each pending independent claim. Thus, Applicant submits that the rejection under 35 USC 112 has been overcome.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, 19 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent Publication No. 2004/0173506 of Doktycz et al. (herein "Doktycz").

For the purpose of expediting issuance of the present application, Applicant has elected to cancel claims currently rejected over Doktycz. Applicant retains the right to pursue any cancelled claim in a continuing application. As claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, and 19 have been cancelled, the current rejection is moot.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 4, 8, 10-18, 21-27 would be allowed if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph and, where appropriate, to include all of the

limitation of the base claim and any intervening claims. As noted above, Applicants have rewritten the claims to obviate the rejection under 35 US 112 and to include the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

CONCLUSION

By way of the amendments and remarks provided herein Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain any outstanding issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Richard Kaba at (312)577-7000 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required by Applicants to Deposit Account No. 06-1135.

Respectfully submitted,

FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY

/jah/

Julie A. Hopper
Reg. No. 50,869
Dated: May 9, 2006

Address all correspondence to:
FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY
Suite 1600 - 120 South LaSalle Street
Chicago, IL 60603-3406

Direct telephone inquiries to:

Richard A. Kaba
312-577-7000